## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JS-6

Date: March 26, 2025

## **CIVIL MINUTES -- GENERAL**

Case No. **CV 25-622-JFW(ASx)** 

Pete Macias -v- County of Los Angeles, et al.

PRESENT:

Title:

HONORABLE JOHN F. WALTER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Shannon Reilly None Present Courtroom Deputy Court Reporter

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PLAINTIFFS: ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR DEFENDANTS:

None None

PROCEEDINGS (IN CHAMBERS): ORDER VACATING TEXT ENTRY ORDER [filed

3/26/2025; Docket No. 21];

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO DISMISS FEDERAL CLAIMS PURSUANT TO FRCP 41(a)(2) AND REQUEST FOR REMAND TO STATE

COURT [filed 3/25/2025; Docket No. 17];

On March 25, 2025, Plaintiff Pete Macias ("Plaintiff") filed a Motion to Dismiss Federal Claims Pursuant to FRCP 41(a)(2) and Request for Remand to State Court ("Motion"). On March 25, 2025, Plaintiff and Defendant County of Los Angeles filed a Joint Statement Re: Meet and Confer Pursuant to Local Rule 7-3, advising that Defendant does not oppose Plaintiff's dismissal of his federal claims.

In light of Defendant's non-opposition, the Court **VACATES** its Text Entry Order filed on March 26, 2025 striking Plaintiff's Motion and **GRANTS** Plaintiff's Motion. Plaintiff's federal claims are dismissed with prejudice, and the Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c); *Satey v. JPMorgan Chase & Co.*, 521 F.3d 1087, 1091 (9th Cir. 2008) (quoting *Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill*, 484 U.S. 343, 351 (1988)) ("'[I]n the usual case in which all federal-law claims are eliminated before trial, the balance of factors to be considered under the pendent jurisdiction doctrine – judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity – will point toward declining to exercise jurisdiction over the remaining state law claims."). Accordingly, this action is hereby **REMANDED** to Los Angeles County Superior Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.